UNPUBLISHED

UNITED STATES COURT OF APPEALS FOR THE FOURTH CIRCUIT

No. 18-2498	
ANTHONY G. BRYANT,	
Plaintiff - App	pellant,
v.	
	EERS; SOUTH CAROLINA DEPARTMENT ENTAL CONTROL, SCDHEC; ATTORNEY ED STATES; CHARLESTON COUNTY
Defendants - A	Appellees.
	District Court for the District of South Carolina, at Senior District Judge. (2:18-cv-03037-MBS-MGB)
Submitted: February 21, 2019	Decided: February 25, 2019
Before GREGORY, Chief Judge, a	nd AGEE and DIAZ, Circuit Judges.
Affirmed by unpublished per curia	m opinion.
Anthony G. Bryant, Appellant Pro	Se.
Unpublished opinions are not bindi	ing precedent in this circuit.

PER CURIAM:

Anthony G. Bryant seeks to appeal the district court's order denying his motion to proceed in forma pauperis. We may exercise jurisdiction only over final orders, 28 U.S.C. § 1291 (2012), and certain interlocutory and collateral orders, 28 U.S.C. § 1292 (2012); Fed. R. Civ. P. 54(b); *Cohen v. Beneficial Indus. Loan Corp.*, 337 U.S. 541, 545-46 (1949). An order denying a motion to proceed in forma pauperis is an appealable interlocutory order. *Roberts v. United States Dist. Ct.*, 339 U.S. 844, 845 (1950) (per curiam). We have reviewed the record and find no abuse of discretion. *Dillard v. Liberty Loan Corp.*, 626 F.2d 363, 365 (4th Cir. 1980) (stating standard of review). Accordingly, although we grant leave to proceed in forma pauperis in this court, we affirm for the reasons stated by the district court. *Bryant v. U.S. Army Corps of Eng'rs*, No. 2:18-cv-03037-MBS-MGB (D.S.C. Nov. 28, 2018). We dispense with oral argument because the facts and legal contentions are adequately presented in the materials before this court and argument would not aid the decisional process.

AFFIRMED